

**R E M A R K S****I. Status of Application**

Claims 1-15, 17-26, 28-30, 32, 33, and 37-61 are pending. Claims 1, 12, 22, 37 and 41 are amended. Claim 7 is cancelled without prejudice. Claims 62-64 are added. Claim 56 has been allowed.

The Examiner is thanked for discussing the application with the undersigned attorney on December 2, 2008. At least certain of the amendments made herein and the prior art was discussed. No agreement was reached.

**II. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103****A. Rejections over Kormos in view of August**

Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-11, and 37-55 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,198,285 (“Kormos”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,503,188 (“August ‘188”).

**1. Independent Claim 1**

Independent claim 1, which defines a room for use in conducting medical procedures, comprising, in part, a “magnetic resonance imaging assembly” and a screen disposed, at least in part, within a volume defined by the magnetic resonance imaging assembly. The magnetic resonance imaging assembly comprises “first and second opposed ferromagnetic elements,” “first and second ferromagnetic pole supports connected to the first and second ferromagnetic elements,” and “first and second poles supported by the first and second pole supports.” Claim 1 has been amended to further require “a floor and a ceiling between” the first and second opposed ferromagnetic elements of the MRI assembly. Claim 1 has also been amended to recite that the screen extends “a distance from proximate the first ferromagnetic element to proximate the second ferromagnetic element.” At least one storage means is provided

“for storing at least a portion of the screen. A plurality of “seperate scenes are provided serially on the screen” and “at least some of the plurality of scenes extend[ing] the distance from proximate the first ferromagnetic element to proximate the second ferromagnetic element.”

Claim 1 has also been amended to require “means for changing a scene for display by moving the screen out of the storage means and at least partially across the room sufficiently to display a new scene.”

Kormos discloses an MRI control system for controlling the operation of an MRI scanner from within an RF shielded MRI exam room. (Abstract). A “display control terminal 24” is connected to an external surface of the “MRI scanner 12.” (Fig. 2). August ‘188 discloses a rollable visual display designed to promote relaxation in a hospital room. (Col. 11, lines 61-64). The rollable visual display comprises fabric or paper, and is mounted on a support structure that is attached to a viewer’s bed, or mounted on a wall. (Col. 12, lines 4-46). Individual scenes are displayed.

As has been previously argued, the claimed screen is disposed, at least in part, “within a volume defined by the magnetic resonance imaging assembly,” as shown in Fig. 1A and Fig. 3A, for example. In Kormos, in contrast, the display/control terminal 24 is connected to an external surface of the MRI scanning system 12 by an arm 28. As shown in Fig. 2 of Kormos, the display/control terminal 24 is adjacent to the imaging volume and is outside of the MRI scanning system, not within the scanning system, as claimed.

In addition, neither Kormos nor August ‘188 show or suggest providing a floor and a ceiling between first and second pole supports of an MRI assembly as in amended claim 1. Such an arrangement is not possible with the MRI assembly of Kormos.

Furthermore, neither Kormos nor August '188 teach or suggest extending a screen and an image from a first ferromagnetic element to a second ferromagnetic element (which support the pole supports), as in amended claim 1. Kormos does not show the claimed first and second ferromagnetic elements, since Kormos is a different type of MRI assembly than that claimed. Also, the image shown in August is very small and simple means of deployment are disclosed. There is no teaching or suggestion to extend an image across a room to the claimed extent or how to do so. Serial images on a screen are not disclosed, either. Means for changing a scene for display by moving the screen out of the storage means and at least partially across the room sufficiently to display a new scene" is not disclosed, either.

Claim 1 and the claims dependent upon it would not, therefore, have been obvious in light of Kormos and August '188. The dependent claims contain allowable subject matter, as well.

Withdrawal of the rejection and reconsideration of the claims are respectfully requested.

## 2. **Independent Claim 37**

Independent claim 37 defines a method of using a room for a medical procedure. Claim 37 requires "removably attaching a portion of a screen to a belt, the screen comprising a plurality of scenes, each scene comprising at least one image" and "moving the belt to move the screen across a room to display a selected one of the scenes in the room." (Emphasis added). As the belt moves across the room, remaining portions of the screen are removably attached to the belt. Claim 37 also requires "positioning a patient with respect to a magnetic resonance imaging assembly in the room," and "performing the medical procedure."

Neither Kormos nor August '188 teach or suggest providing a separate screen and belt, removably attaching a portion of the screen to the belt, moving the belt to move the screen across

a room, and, “removably attaching remaining portions of the screen to the belt as the belt moves the screen across the room” as claimed.

If the Examiner maintains this rejection, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate where in the cited art such limitations are shown.

Withdrawal of the rejection and reconsideration of the claims are respectfully requested.

**B. Rejections over Kormos in view of August '188 and Simson**

Claims 3, 12-15, 17-26, 28-30, 32, and 33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Kormos in view of August '188 and U.S. Patent No. 5,493,802 (“Simson”). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

**1. Claim 3**

Claim 3 is dependent on claim 1 and is allowable because claim 1 is allowable, as discussed above. Claim 3 also contains subject matter not shown in Kormos, August '88, Simson. No switch, as claimed, is shown.

Withdrawal of the rejection and reconsideration of the claim are respectfully requested.

**2. Amended Independent Claim 12**

Independent claim 12, which defines a room for use in conducting medical procedures, requires “a magnetic resonance imaging assembly having an imaging volume,” “a screen,” and “a plurality of images on the screen.” A track extends across at least a portion of the room. The track defines a groove for receiving a portion of the screen. Means are provided for moving the portion of the screen through the groove. Claim 12 has been amended to require “a floor, a ceiling, and at least one wall between the floor and the ceiling.” The MRI assembly is said to be “within the room.” Claim 12 has also been amended to require that the track be “attached to at least a ceiling of the room”, and that the means for moving the portion of the screen be “at least

in part within the groove.” Support for the amendments to claim 12 is found in Fig. 11, for example.

Kormos and August ‘188 are discussed above. Simson discloses a scroll displaying mechanism comprising a motor 20 that causes rotation of a driving pulleys 5, 6, which rotate rollers 3, 4, around which the scroll 2 is wound. (Col. 2, lines 46-51). A “mounting frame apparatus 70” includes two “elongated support members 90, 91” which functions as guides to “provide tracking for the scroll to keep the currently displayed portion of the scroll in a substantially planar orientation for viewing.” (Col. 5, lines 47-54, col. 6, lines 14-20; Fig. 7).

None of the examples shown in August ‘188 use a track or “a track attached to at least a ceiling of the room, and extending across at least a portion of the room,” as claimed. Kormos does not discuss a “track” at all. In Simson, the two “elongated support members 90, 91” are attached to the “mounting frame apparatus 70,” not to a “ceiling,” as claimed.

In addition, neither Kormos, August ‘188, nor Simson show a means within a groove for moving a screen through the groove, as claimed. In Simson, the means for moving the screen is a motor coupled to the rollers, outside of the groove.

Amended claim 12 and its dependent claims are therefore patentable over the cited art.

Withdrawal of the rejection and reconsideration of the claims are respectfully requested.

### 3. Independent Claim 22.

Independent claim 22, which defines a room for use in conducting a medical procedure, has been amended to require “a medical imaging device at least partially within a room.”

Amended claim 22 further requires a screen with at least one image. The screen is removably attachable to a belt by mating hook and loop material on the screen and hook and loop material on the belt. Movement of the belt when the screen is removably attached to the belt causes removal of a remaining portion of the screen from the cartridge and movement of the screen

along the track to display an image in the room, as well as “entry of a previously displayed portion of the screen into the at least one cartridge. The track and the belt are configured to compress the hook and loop material on the screen against the hook and loop material on the belt to removably attach the remaining portion of the screen to the belt as the belt draws the screen into the track “and to remove the previously displayed portion of the screen from the belt prior to entry of the previously displayed portion of the screen into the at least one cartridge.”

As discussed above, August ‘188 does not show a track. Neither does Kormos. Simson does not show a screen removably attachable to and detachable from a belt and is otherwise configured as claimed. Simson’s reference to Velcro(R) in column 6, lines 49-62, does not at all relate to the attachment of a screen to a belt, as claimed. Neither Simson nor the other references show a screen attached to a belt, as claimed.

Claim 22 and the claims dependent upon it are not, therefore, unpatentable over Kormos, August ‘188, and Simson. The dependent claims include patentable subject matter, as well.

Withdrawal of the rejection and reconsideration of the claims are respectfully requested.

#### 4. Claims 28-30 and 32-33

Claims 28-30 and 32-33 depend from independent claim 56, which is allowed. Therefore, claims 28-30 and 32-33 are also allowable.

Withdrawal of the rejection and reconsideration of the claims are respectfully requested.

#### C. Kormos, August ‘188 and U.S. Patent No. 5,917,395 (“Overweg”)

Claims 8, 48, and 53 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Kormos in view of August ‘188 and Overweg. Overweg shows an MRI system with a ceiling mounted illumination.

Claim 8 is dependent on claim 1. Claim 48 is dependent on claim 37. Claim 53 is dependent on claim 22. Since claims 1, 22, and 37 are patentable over the cited art, as discussed

above, claims 8, 48, and 53 should also be patentable over the cited art. Claims 8, 48 and 53 contain allowable subject matter, as well.

Withdrawal of the rejection and reconsideration of the claims are respectfully requested.

**D. Rejections over Kormos in view of August '188 and U.S. Patent No. 4,173,087 ("Saylor")**

Claims 13 and 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Kormos in view of August '188 and Saylor. Claims 13 and 21 are dependent on claim 12, which is patentable over the cited art, as discussed above. Claims 13 and 21 should, therefore, be patentable over the cited art, as well. Claims 13 and 21 contain allowable subject matter, as well.

Withdrawal of the rejection and reconsideration of the claims are respectfully requested.

**III. New Claims**

New claims 62 and 63 recite, which are dependent on claim 1, additional features described in the specification and drawings. No new matter is added. New claim 64, which is dependent on claim 12, is similar to claim 63.

**IV. Conclusion**

Allowance of the application in light of these Amendments and Remarks is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
Kaye Scholer LLP

Date: December 11, 2008

Kaye Scholer LLP  
425 Park Avenue  
New York, NY 10022

By



Brandon N. Sklar  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 31,667  
212-836-8653